PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011

Applicant	San Luis and Delta Mendota Water Authority	**Amount Requested**	$84,445
Proposal Title	Westside-San Joaquin Regional Stormwater Flood Management Grant Application	**Total Proposal Cost**	$168,890

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

This Project is the second phase of a larger project to increase the capacity of the California Avenue Storm Drain Basin. This new lift station will remedy the overflows during heavy storms, reduce the damage caused by the overflows, and reduce use of public resources to prevent the damage and will capture the excess water for agricultural reuse.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	**6/15**	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits	**6/12**
Budget	**4/5**	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	**0/12**
Schedule	**3/5**	Program Preferences	**8/10**
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	**3/5**		
		Total Score (max. possible = 64)	**30**

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Work Plan

The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete. The application states that the Project design is 50% complete, but does not include design plans and specifications. Scientific and technical information that supports the feasibility of the Project are not included. The Work Plan tasks were not detailed adequately to insure the completeness of the Project. More detail regarding the size and equipment needed for the pump station would improve the understanding of the Work Plan; as it is left to the reviewer to assume that the design will incorporate the same or similar specifications of equipment for the permanent lift station as used currently with the temporary equipment. Conceptual sketches of the new lift station and a better map of the California Avenue Storm Drain Basin and Project area would have been helpful, as the maps provided were not legible. The Work Plan does not mention any permits that may be required. Finally, the Work Plan states that the Project is the second phase of a larger project in the Project List section, and then states that it is a standalone project in the Integrated Elements section.

Budget

The Budget includes detailed cost information for most of the items as described in Attachment 4 and costs seem reasonable, but there is a lack of supporting documentation for some of the tasks the Budget categories of Exhibit B. For example, there is no documentation nor an explanation for how the construction cost of $73,000 is estimated. Under other costs, there is a lump sum of $50,000 for PG&E work; however, there is no discussion in the Work Plan, Budget, or Schedule as to what this work entails and when it will occur. The labor tasks of the Budget are well laid out, and it appears to be reasonable for the scope of work, and is sufficiently supported with expected hours, billing rate, and overall cost.

Schedule

The Schedule is not entirely consistent with the Work Plan and Budget. The Work Plan does not include tasks to develop finances, contract closeout period, and Permits & Right of Way clearance, which are shown on the Schedule. The Schedule does not show the Tasks 1 and 7 (Administration and Construction Administration) as documented in the Work Plan. The only milestones noted are for the grant award and grant completion. Also, it does not seem reasonable that the contract closeout period is the same length of time as the construction task.

Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

The criterion is less than fully addressed and the rationales are incomplete. The output indicators of success will be based on visual inspection of the streets subject to flooding and monitoring water levels in the basin. The targets should be easily met provided that the Project is sufficiently designed and engineered to draw down the basin within a reasonable timeframe during and after each rain event. The application mentions an added benefit of using the excess storm flows for agricultural irrigation via the James Irrigation District Canal. The installation and use of a flow meter would be an appropriate measure to monitor the volume of water being discharged into the James Irrigation District Canal.

Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction (FDR) and Water Supply Benefits

Average levels of FDR and Water Supply benefits can be realized through this proposal; however, the quality of the analysis is partially lacking and/or supporting documentation is partially unsubstantiated. The FDR analysis was largely based on assumptions or numbers stated with little or no documentation. The water supply benefits are based on the local irrigation district's claimed value of irrigation water, which is not representative of water during a storm event; no evidence was presented to demonstrate that the water could be stored for later use during the irrigation season.

Economic Analysis – Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits

No water quality or other benefits are described in this proposal.

Program Preferences

The proposal demonstrates with a significant degree of certainty that a number of Program Preferences can be achieved by implementing the proposed project. Thorough documentation with breadth and magnitude is provided for the following Program Preferences: Regional Project, Practice of Integrated Flood Management, Address critical water supply or water quality needs of Disadvantged Communities, and ensuring Equitable Distribution of Benefits.